

REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE FALLS CHURCH PLANNING COMMISSION
2 January 2007
Council Chamber

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Rodgers called the meeting to order at 7:47 PM.

2. ROLL CALL:

Members Present:	Ms. Budetti
	Mr. Burnett
	Ms. Fauber
	Mr. Holran
	Mr. Puentes
	Ms. Rodgers
	Ms. Sanders

Administrative Staff Present:	Ms. Friel, General Manager of Development Services/ Planning Director
	Ms. Block Sanford, Senior Planner

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

Chair Rodgers turned the meeting over to Ms. Friel to preside for the Election of Officers.

Ms. Friel opened the floor to nominations for Planning Commission Chair for the ensuing year. Ms. Fauber nominated, and Ms. Sanders seconded, Ms. Rodgers as Chair. Hearing no further nominations, Ms. Friel closed nominations for Chair. By a show of hands, Ms. Rodgers was elected unanimously as Chair of the Planning Commission for the ensuing year.

Ms. Friel opened the floor to nominations for Planning Commission Vice Chair for the ensuing year. Mr. Burnett nominated, and Ms. Sanders seconded, Mr. Puentes as Vice Chair. Ms. Fauber nominated, and Ms. Sanders seconded, Ms. Budetti as Vice Chair. Hearing no further nominations, Ms. Friel closed the nominations for Vice Chair. By a show of hands, Mr. Puentes was elected as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission for the ensuing year.

Following the election, Ms. Friel returned the meeting to Chair Rodgers and there was a brief recess while Commissioners were re-seated at the dais.

4. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS:

Ms. Sanders advised that today's edition of *The Washington Post* reported on Arlington County's aggressive energy saving policies. She expressed her hope that the City would consider such strategies when it moved forward with redevelopment. Ms. Sanders itemized the types of policies adopted recently by Arlington County to reduce its energy consumption.

Ms. Budetti reported on her experience with a new traffic pattern on Annandale Road at Gundry Drive. Two stop signs had been installed on the curve of Annandale Road and a crosswalk had been painted. She was surprised by the new traffic pattern and suggested ways in which drivers could be alerted to the change.

Ms. Budetti stated that she was sorry that two Planning Commissioners with whom she had served for a number of years are retiring. She advised that Mr. Burnett and Mr. Holran would serve well on anticipated big new projects, such as City Center, if they remained as Commissioners. She thanked them for their hard and thoughtful work during their terms of office. Chair Rodgers echoed Ms. Budetti's comments on the loss of these Commissioners and stated that they had agreed to continue serving until the City Council had appointed their replacements. Ms. Fauber expressed her belief that the Commission had worked well because Commissioners had not always seen eye-to-eye and had not 'rubber stamped' applications. She agreed that Mr. Burnett and Mr. Holran would be missed.

5. RECEIPT OF PETITIONS: None.

6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT/WORKSESSION SCHEDULE:

Ms. Friel reported on the items scheduled for the Commission's consideration this evening. The Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2008-2012 will be presented. Public Hearings and worksessions on the CIP are on the Commission's agenda through 20 February, when the Commission is scheduled to make its recommendations to the City Manager. CIP worksessions on Schools, Administrative Services, and Public Safety Projects are scheduled on 16 January; on Community Services and Environmental Services Projects on 5 February; and additional worksessions will be scheduled as needed.

Ms. Friel announced that the City had released the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Zoning Code rewrite. Submissions are due by the end of January and a consultant will be selected as soon as possible.

7. OLD BUSINESS: None.

8. NEW BUSINESS:

A. VARIANCE V-1483-06 BY JEFFERSON PARK, LLC OF McLEAN, VA, OWNER AND APPLICANT, FOR 800 WEST BROAD STREET, LOT 21, BLOCK B, RPC 51-201-001; 802 WEST BROAD STREET, LOT 20, BLOCK B, RPC 51-201-002; 804 WEST BROAD STREET, LOT 19, BLOCK B, RPC 51-201-003; and 806 WEST BROAD STREET, LOT 18, BLOCK B, RPC 51-201-2004, FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 38-28(a)(10) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF FALLS CHURCH TO ALLOW A SIDE YARD SETBACK OF NINE (9) FEET INSTEAD OF THE REQUIRED TWENTY (20) FOOT SETBACK

Robert Young and Joe Wetzel of Jefferson Park, LLC, applicant, were present.

Ms. Block Sanford reported that the Planning Commission is requested to make a recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) on a setback variance request for a commercial property. Section 38-11(a) of the City's Zoning Ordinance specifies that the Zoning Administrator may refer variances to the Planning Commission, and the Commission may forward recommendations to the BZA after considering the variance in relation to the Comprehensive Plan and other City planning issues. This is not a site plan review or approval, although key site plan elements relate to the review of the variance.

Jefferson Park, LLC of McLean, Virginia, owner and site plan applicant, requested a variance to Section 38-28(a)(10) to permit a side yard setback of nine (9) feet instead of the required twenty (20) feet. The subject parcels are zoned B-1, Limited Business District, and are designated as "Business" on the adopted Future Land Use Map. The applicant seeks a variance for the side yard setback where the subject site abuts the St. James School, which is zoned R-1B, Medium Density Residential District, and designated as "Private Institution" on the Future Land Use Map. The variance application is scheduled for the BZA's 11 January 2007 meeting.

As stated in the Comprehensive Plan, the purpose of the residential districts is to maintain the City's residential character and to protect residential uses from nonresidential development. The 20-foot setback required by the City Code is necessary to protect the residential use (the school) from the commercial development proposed.

The Planning Commission may also consider other City planning issues in making its recommendation. As part of the site plan application, the applicant seeks Planning Commission approval of two landscape waivers. The first waiver requested is to Section 38-30(e) of the City Code, which requires buffer strips between zoning districts. A 20-foot buffer is required between adjacent properties that are within different zoning districts. The second waiver requested is to Section 38-30(c)(2)(b) of the City Code, which addresses perimeter parking lot landscaping adjacent to abutting properties zoned residential. A solid landscaped planting strip that is at least five (5) feet in height and that is at least ten (10) feet in width shall be provided, according to the Code.

Additionally, Section 38-29(h) of the City Code, Required Considerations, for site plans, lists a number of other criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing the final site plan. These considerations include: consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and its Future Land Use Map; impacting of existing and approved uses on adjacent property; adequacy of shielding of open parking through the use of walls, fences, screening, plantings, and earthworks; and adequacy of landscaping.

The landscape screening proposed is inadequate and the variance requested would affect the applicant's ability to provide an adequate landscaping buffer between the site/parking area and the adjacent R-1B site, as required by the City Code. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the BZA that the variance be denied as it would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other planning principles related to adequacy of landscaping buffers and screening of commercial parking areas.

Mr. Young expressed his belief that the Code requirements rest on two technicalities. He noted that although the adjacent property is zoned residential it has been used as a school for over 50

years. It is not anticipated that the school use would change and the parcels immediately adjacent to the subject site are used for parking. Mr. Young stated that the City Code permits building heights of up to 55 feet in height within 20 feet of an adjacent residential use. His plan includes a parking deck, at a height of 10 feet, and an associated stairwell, at a height of 15 feet, adjacent to the school's site. Mr. Young indicated that his request for the variance was reasonable given the existing conditions and the use proposed.

In response to Commissioners's inquiries, Ms. Friel noted that the subject parcels are corner lots. Under the Zoning Code provisions, a corner lot has two front yards and two side yards in terms of adjacent uses. The use proposed mandates the setbacks; the front yard setbacks have been met. However, the 10 foot buffer is not provided. She clarified that the Planning Commission grants waivers and the BZA grants variances for land use issues on pending site plan applications. The Commission makes nonbinding recommendations to the BZA on variances, based on the Comprehensive Plan. However, the BZA's decision is based on different Code criteria and its decision affects the associated site plan. The applicant had filed a site plan and staff comments were provided to the applicant. The City Arborist's comments noted that two landscape waivers would be required if the variance were granted. She further commented that the landscape space provided is inadequate for healthy plantings and that screening between the use proposed and the school's playground is important. Ms. Friel concurred that the plat provided appears to meet the Comprehensive Plan's stated goals for development in terms of setback from the street, height, and density.

Mr. Burnett asked why a 20 foot setback would still be required if the building design met the Comprehensive Plan's goals and the adjacent use was, basically, a paved surface. Ms. Friel expressed her belief that that was a big leap. The City's Landscape Ordinance was the major piece of legislation recently adopted after two years of work by a committee and community input. The Landscape Ordinance reflects the community's sensitivity to commercial uses adjacent to residential uses; the majority of West Broad Street is adjacent to residential uses.

In response to Commissioners's questions, Mr. Young stated that the parking structure proposed would have parking at the surface and on one deck. The building will be four-stories. If a twenty- foot setback were provided, then two vertical rows of parking would be lost.

In response to Ms. Fauber's request, Mr. Wetzel distributed copies of the parking deck's elevation with a line representing the building height proposed, and a photograph of existing conditions along the shared property lines. Mr. Young indicated that the elevation was from the north, or the adjacent property. The landscaping plan is being revised and a green roof for the building is planned. He stated that stormwater detention had been discussed with staff. Mr. Young expressed his intention to provide a nine-foot, well planted buffer that would be a vast improvement over existing conditions.

In response to further questions from Commissioners, Mr. Young indicated that the upper parking deck would be accessed from West Broad Street, that the site is very tight, that there are few lots zoned B-1 that are not adjacent to residentially zoned lots, and that the City had expressed its desire for as much commercial development on West Broad Street as possible. He stated that the building proposed would be entirely commercial uses, that a majority of uses on the south side of Park Avenue are adjacent to business uses and are zoned transitional, and that

underground parking is precluded given the site's size. Mr. Young noted that he had requested parking reductions for other projects; such requests were not well received by staff. Ms. Friel stated that staff would welcome a discussion concerning shared parking on this site; the Code requires 142 parking spaces for this site; 146 spaces were proposed. Mr. Young stated that the existing parking lot in the 700 block of West Broad Street would not be available for shared parking. A portion of that lot is committed currently for construction worker parking. He expressed his intent to build a hotel and a 10,000 square foot office building in the 700 block of West Broad Street; those two uses would share parking facilities to receive a 25% reduction in the number of parking spaces required by the City Code.

Ms. Fauber expressed her belief that plan proposed did not change the character of the area. The school was not a residential use and noted that the Zoning Code does not have an institutional district. She concurred that this is the type of development that the Comprehensive Plan supports. Ms. Fauber suggested that if the school property were to be redeveloped, it would likely be at a much higher density.

Chair Rodgers expressed her belief that the development would suffer from the loss of a full planting area, but would not impact the adjacent property. She hoped that the applicant would consider the maximum amount of plant material possible and that the architect would consider the City's desire to reduce the amount of impervious surfaces. Mr. Young said that the landscape plan was being revised and described some of the features planned.

In response to further questions from Commissioners, Ms. Friel stated that the Zoning Division had prepared an adjacent property owner notice for the BZA's meeting, which included information on tonight's Planning Commission's public hearing. The Planning Division had not received any comments to date. She reiterated that the City Arborist had commented on the site plan submittal that the nine-foot planting area proposed was inadequate; a twenty-foot landscaped area is required. Ms. Friel noted that an email concerning a variance granted previously, and referenced by Mr. Wetzel, had been provided to Commissioners this afternoon. After review of the referenced variance, staff found that that application did not relate to the application before the Commission tonight. The BZA had granted the previous variance based on the unusual configuration of the residential lot adjacent to a church-owned property.

Ms. Budetti recalled that the Commission had considered a nine-foot landscaped area at The Spectrum (444 West Broad Street). The City Arborist had commented on that application that such a planting area was inadequate. Ms. Budetti advocated a full buffer given the likely removal of existing trees and the increase in the impervious surface proposed with this project. She expressed her hope that the applicant would reconsider the parking area to determine if more flexibility in configuration would permit a larger landscaped area. Mr. Young expressed his belief that the impermeable surfaces would be mitigated, at least in part, by the green roof proposed. He stated that the building could be built to the lot line on the west, but that he was providing another nine-foot buffer there, which was plenty of room in which to grow large trees. Ms. Budetti complimented Mr. Young for including a green roof, but noted that that technology had not been tested in Falls Church. She again requested a combination of open space and greenery on the subject site.

Mr. Burnett advised that two-hour parking is available on North Oak Street and asked how many on-street parking spaces were provided. He agreed that business parking needed to be accommodated, but that existing off-site spaces could be used to achieve larger landscaped buffers.

In response to Commissioners' questions, Mr. Young stated that the North Oak Street setback is approximately 15 feet and does not have a landscape buffer. He concurred that the building footprint was located on the west property line, within 10 feet of the existing structure owned by St. James Church.

Mr. Holran expressed his desire for the City to construct public parking structures throughout the City, but particularly in the 700 or 800 block of West Broad Street. He noted that Mr. Young had received a waiver for his development at 402 West Broad Street to permit a reduction in the landscape buffer from ten to eight feet and for vehicles to overhang the planting area. Additionally, the Commission had granted parking waivers were granted for Eckerd Drug. Mr. Holran stated that a buffer between the commercial use and the school's play area was important and it was important for the buffer to be of sufficient size. He noted that the City reviews potential development parcel by parcel. Approving plans in this manner eliminates the ability to create open spaces and buffers throughout commercial districts. Mr. Holran agreed that the design proposed meets the Comprehensive Plan's goals, but that the rear of the site also needs to meet the Code's requirements.

In response to Mr. Holran's questions, Mr. Young indicated that if thirty-eight parking spaces were eliminated, then he would have to reduce the building by one floor. He agreed that market forces, as well as Code requirements, would make a smaller building economically infeasible. Ms. Fauber noted Mr. Young's intent to consolidate four small parcels to redevelop commercial property, which is a Comprehensive Plan goal. She inquired whether a 10 foot buffer would be sufficient.

In response to Ms. Sanders's inquiries, Ms. Friel replied that the applicant had chosen to move forward with his variance request now. She reiterated that staff had reviewed the site plan submittal and had provided several pages of comments to the applicant on 14 December 2006. Ms. Sanders advised that she was uncomfortable considering the variance separately from the site plan. Mr. Young indicated that the project could not be built without the variance and that he would not expend funds to revise the site plan unless the variance was granted.

Ms. Budetti advised that she understood Mr. Young's business consequences. She hoped that the site plan could be reconfigured to permit the maximum number of parking spaces without unnecessarily increasing the impervious surface of the parcels to be redeveloped. Ms. Budetti concurred with Ms. Sanders's comments and noted that this is the first time that the Planning Commission has seen the design proposed.

In response to Commissioners's inquiries, Ms. Friel indicated that it was difficult to balance competing Comprehensive Plan goals. The site plan apparently has several moving parts; some design aspects were discussed for the first time tonight. She noted that the staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Zoning Appeals denial of the variance, based on some Comprehensive Plan goals. The Commission's recommendation to the

BZA is advisory. Unfortunately, the Commission had not yet seen either the site plan or the numerous staff comments on that submission. Staff believes that the required buffers are important and, per Code, a buffer is required on the western lot line. Staff had not discussed shared parking for this site with the applicant. The BZA will consider the Commission's recommendation and its differing Code standards during its public hearing on the variance request. Any variance granted applies to the land, not to a particular application.

Mr. Puentes noted the City Arborist's comments concerning the size of the planting area, but did not have the expertise to understand what could or could not be planted in a nine-foot area. He expressed his belief that the buffer required was critical.

Mr. Holran stated that Mr. Puentes had raised an interesting point that the variance is associated with the land. If the variance were granted for the subject site, then any developer could build a fifty-five foot high building with nine foot buffers in the side yards. Ms. Friel concurred, but noted that the BZA often conditions its approval of variances.

MOTION: Mr. Holran moved, and Mr. Puentes seconded, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Zoning Appeals that the variance requested for 800, 802, 804, and 806 West Broad Street be granted, but with strong conditions to the conceptual plan presented for which the Planning Commission makes no pretense that the landscape issues have been resolved nor would the issues be resolved until the associated site plan is considered.

Discussion:

Ms. Budetti indicated that she would vote against the motion. She noted that the issue of impermeable surfaces went beyond a green roof. A green roof might retain stormwater, but would not clean the water as the does the soil. Ms. Budetti expressed her belief that a redesign of the proposal would improve the site plan, meet parking requirements, and decrease the amount of impervious surface proposed.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passed 5-2 (Ms. Budetti and Ms. Sanders voted 'no').

Chair Rodgers thanked staff for its timely response to questions raised by Commissioners today. She advised that the information received was helpful in the Commission's deliberations.

B. PRESENTATION OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP) FOR FISCAL YEARS 2008-2012

Cindy Mester, Acting Assistant City Manager; Lois Berlin, Superintendent of Schools; and Craig Cheney, School Board Chair; were present.

Ms. Mester stated that the Planning Commission had received a copy of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2008-2012 in its package. A copy of tonight's presentation and an update sheet were distributed to the Commission this evening.

Ms. Mester provided an overview of the CIP that included key policy decisions, a financial forecast, a list of projects included in the CIP, and the review schedule. The key policies included funding for a public-private partnership to secure affordable housing, a study of existing affordable housing, funding to be used as leverage for federal, state, and private funds for affordable housing; open space acquisition, athletic fields acquisition in cooperation with surrounding jurisdictions, and implementation of master plans for City parks; Schools projects, which Dr. Berlin and Mr. Cheney would explain in greater detail; City Hall improvements; Public Utilities, including a US Army Corps of Engineers survey and model, level of service determinations, annual replacements and upgrades of equipment, streambank restoration and daylighting, and seeking alternate revenue sources to complete priority projects; and Transportation, including Broad Street improvements, public investment in the City Center, and traffic calming and focusing on pedestrian and bicycle movement on residential streets.

Ms. Mester displayed charts depicting the City's debt and reserve policies. The established policies dictate that the City's total outstanding debt may not exceed five percent of the value of taxable real estate, and the City's annual debt service may not exceed twelve percent of governmental expenditures. The charts showed the comparison of actual debt to the policy limit and the debt service as a percentage of expenditures. The City's reserve policies are to maintain a reserve fund balance in the range of eight to twelve percent of the City's budget and to designate funds in excess of 12% only for one time capital expenses. Existing fiscal constraints require new approaches: one percent of total revenues will be dedicated to funding the CIP; and some projects would proceed only if grant funded or offset by higher than anticipated revenues.

Ms. Mester outlined the projects included in the CIP for 2008-2012. Administrative Services includes \$100,000 for document management in FY 2009, a replacement of the telephone system in FY 2008 for \$170,000, and technology at \$170,000 in FY 2008 and \$100,000 in FY 2009. The Department of Community Services includes Housing and Human Services and Recreation and Parks. Housing and Human Services projects include \$2,000,000 in FY 2008 for acquisition and development of affordable housing. Recreation and Parks projects include rectangular athletic fields at \$475,000 in FY 2008, implementation of park master plans with \$160,000 in FY 2008, \$150,000 in FY 2009, and \$100,000 in FY 2010, as well as implementation of the Hamlett/Rees master plan at \$175,000 in FY 2008. Public Safety projects include fire station upgrades in FY 2011 for \$125,000, purchase of a ladder truck in FY 2010 for a total of \$400,000 following the sale of an older ladder truck for \$350,000, and a "Smartzone" radio upgrade in FY 2010 at a cost of \$330,000. Public Works projects include the Washington Street Streetscape Design, Broad Street Improvements in the Village Section, City Facilities reinvestment, City Hall improvements, Storm Water Facility Improvements, Tripps Run Streambank, Daylighting of Piped Streams, Pedestrian and Traffic Calming Improvements, City Center Intermodal Transit, and City Center Intermodal Transit Center for a total of \$19,353,000 over the next five fiscal years. She noted that the land acquisition for relocation of the City's Property Yard listed in previous CIPs had been removed as it is unlikely that a new site would be purchased, given current fiscal constraints. Ms. Mester advised that the Planning Commission would review these projects in greater detail during worksessions over the next several weeks. She deferred to Dr. Berlin and Mr. Cheney for their presentation of Schools projects.

Mr. Cheney reported that CIP Schools Projects completed recently came in at approximately \$1M under budget. He stated that the Schools began studying its long term facilities

maintenance needs last year. New issues include security, the life cycle of facilities, a long term vision and strategy for community needs within school facilities, and an identification of the needs of older buildings so that planning can begin now. Mr. Cheney advised that the CIP Schools Projects are projected at \$52,405,000 over the next five fiscal years. More importantly, the goal is joint facility planning for long term community goals.

Dr. Berlin stated that the enrollment study planned for FY 2008 had been moved to FY 2009 to permit new residential construction in the City to be occupied prior to the study. The study is projected to cost \$100,000. The Schools are managing their capacity at this time. Long-term facility planning, placed in FY 2008 at a cost of \$550,000, is a lynch pin in creating learning environments that the community expects. The Systems Replacement, Renewal, and Modernization is budgeted at \$258,000 in FY 2008, at \$222,000 in FY 2009, at \$70,000 in FY 2011, and \$405,000 in FY 2012 for a total of \$955,000. Future construction, whether new or renovation, is shown at \$800,000 in FY 2011 and at \$50,000,000 in FY 2012 for a total of \$50,800,000. She stated that she and the School Board looked forward to discussing their projects in greater detail with the Planning Commission during its worksession.

Ms. Mester's presentation included information on grant/alternate funding projects, total debt financed, anticipated one percent revenues dedicated to CIP projects, and Pay As You Go (PAUG) projects. She emphasized the importance of the Planning Commission's recommendation on the CIP being made by 20 February so that that information could be incorporated into the City's General Fund budget. The following worksessions have been scheduled, and more may be scheduled as needed: 16 January to review Administrative Services, Public Safety, and Schools Projects; and 5 February to review Environmental Services and Community Services Projects, and outstanding issues.

Chair Rodgers thanked Ms. Mester for a good overview presentation and for excellent notebooks with background information.

In response to Ms. Budetti's questions, Dr. Berlin indicated that the long term facility planning for Schools discussed in previous years had not been done. She also noted that the Schools Land Acquisition Project had been removed. If opportunities arise for the Schools to acquire land, then the School Board will identify those opportunities to the City Council.

Mr. Puentes expressed his support for one percent of the revenue stream being dedicated to Capital Improvements projects. Ms. Mester advised that those funds could be deducted from the PAUG projects, which enabled the City to stay within its debt policies. She referred Commissioners to the chart on Page 10-7 for a conversion of the ratio of debt to revenue, as a dollar amount.

Mr. Holran requested a list of projects submitted for the CIP that were not included. He expressed his appreciation for Ms. Mester's response to his questions from earlier today. Mr. Holran requested a chart of those projects contingent upon grant funding or other revenue sources. He also requested a budget briefing of the fiscal changes between the presentation of last year's CIP and tonight's presentation. Ms. Mester agreed to provide the documents requested and advised that John Tuohy, the City's Chief Financial Officer, is preparing a six

month financial update for the City Council, which will be shared with the Planning Commission.

Ms. Budetti requested clarification on the projected versus the actual revenues. Ms. Mester stated that the FY 2006 revenues were a 17% growth. The current projection of revenue growth is at three percent, based on recent real estate sales.

Mr. Holran commented he found it curious that the CIP did not include funding for City financed parking structure(s). He noted that other jurisdictions are planning for light rail and trolley lines, while the City is planning an intermodal center for only bicycles, taxis, and pedestrians. Ms. Mester noted that the intermodal project had not yet been fully defined, but would be defined through the CIP process. The City has allocated public infrastructure financing for the City Center, but has not specified how those funds would be used. Mr. Holran thanked the Schools for its funding for basic planning and for including realistic funding for its projects. He was encouraged that the funding requests were more realistic than in years past.

MOTION: Mr. Puentes moved, and Ms. Sanders seconded, that the Planning Commission continue its discussion of the CIP for FY 2008-2012 until 16 January 2007.

The motion passed on voice vote.

9. OTHER BUSINESS: None.

10. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL: The Minutes of 20 November 2006 were approved as amended.

11. ADJOURNMENT:

Ms. Sanders moved, and Mr. Puentes seconded, to adjourn. The motion passed by voice vote and the meeting adjourned at 9:49 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Noted and Approved:

Debra L. Gee
Recording Secretary

Elizabeth R. Friel, AICP
Planning Director

The City of Falls Church complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act. This document will be made available in an alternate format upon request. Call 703.248.5040 or the Virginia Relay Center on 711 or 1.800.828.1120.